

Creation

Social Science and Humanities

QUARTERLY



CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

This **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

Voting membership is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of the CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis:

a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or

b. persons 18 years old or over, who have office in another creation-science organization with beliefs substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS. Voting membership dues are \$10 (foreign, \$11 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. **Statement of Belief**. Sustaining membership dues are \$10 (foreign, \$11 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Officers: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Editor: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman

Board of Reference: Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis, Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Mr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

Editorial

Dear Readers:

A recent correspondent made reference to a perceived "identity problem" in the *CSSH Quarterly*. I think I sense what he means and I would tend to agree. However it is a quality which I am generally fond of. I feel we have a sort of intuitive sense of how our Lord would have us proceed but by no means a clearly defined formula or game plan. As editor I would say that I have a much clearer picture of what I don't want than specifically what I do. It is like something on the tip of your tongue — you can't quite get a hold of it yet you feel that it is very near. It is certainly true that if one had asked me to predict the contents of these first three years in advance I would not have come very close at least for many of our entries. Yet I am quite pleased with what we have done. I think the articles have had good scholarly integrity while at the same time exhibiting a great range of depth and complexity. Some have been quite simple and down-to-earth, hopefully appealing to a wide non-technical audience. Others on the other hand have been extremely intricate and scholarly, speaking only to a few with appropriate background and experience. I hope this characteristic will continue. We are not like the *Reader's Digest* nor are we like *Scientific American*. We are not even, I hope, something in between these two, or even worse, something that can't make up its mind whether to be like *Reader's Digest* or *Scientific American*. What are we then? By God's grace I hope we are an instrument of fellowship, edification and love for a little portion of Christ's body — a place where Christians of widely differing levels of intelligence, training, backgrounds, etc., but nevertheless sharing a common interest in the Biblical doctrine of creation and the implications of that doctrine for the arts, humanities and social sciences, can communicate freely and search for ways to further Christ's Kingdom and extend His Gospel.

Paul D. Ackerman

LETTERS AND COMMENTS

I would like to compliment Paul Gosselin on his article, MYTH OF ORIGIN AND THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION in the *CSSH Quarterly* for spring 1981. However, his statements that this origin myth of evolution does not have associated with it a religion is somewhat incorrect since it is so closely associated with the religion of secular humanism.¹

The Supreme Court has on two occasions identified Secular Humanism as a religion; in *Abington vs. Schempp* and *Torcaso vs. Watkins*. In *Torcaso* the court spelled out that "religion" in the constitutional sense includes nontheistic as well as theistic religion and the state is therefore forbidden to prohibit or

promote either form of religion."²

It is this latter point where most problems are found since the state is increasingly promoting secular humanism, a nontheistic religion, and often times Eastern religions and their associated practices such as transcendental meditation, yoga, etc., while excluding the Judeo-Christian religions from consideration and teaching altogether. I am,

Very sincerely

Donald C. Thompson, R.Ph., M.D.
Diplomate, American Board of Family Practise
828 West 4th North Street
Morristown, Tennessee 37814

- ¹ Gurin, J., "The Creationists are Coming," *The Sciences*, April 1981, page 34.
- ² Crater, T.O., "The Unproclaimed Priests of Public Education," *Christianity Today*, April 1981, page 44.

I encountered your quarterly from my sister and her husband who have received it for some time. I thoroughly enjoy your approach and scholarship.

Sincerely yours,

Jerry Starks
P.O. Box 742
Sterling, VA 22170

I read with enthusiasm the article entitled, "The Necessity for Creationism" in Vol. III, No. 1 of the Quarterly.

Yours faithfully,

Gregory T. Gardner
6C, Sunnyside
Devonshire Rd.
Liverpool 8, England

I have been meaning to write and thank your for *CSSHQ*. No one has ever accused me of being a scholar but each issue has taught me the increasing importance of the Creation position in our culture.

In His Service,

Stephen Griffith
Editor of *Arkenstone*
P.O. Box 1606
Mansfield, Ohio 44901

The Futility of Autonomous Speculative Thought

Ellen Myers

My academic foray into philosophy arouses a variety of reactions. One agnostic, burnt out after having sampled a number of philosophies and religious cults, speculated (falsely) that I might be turning from the Biblical Christian faith to philosophy in search of better answers and warned me that it had none. A Christian friend prayed that I might fail to convince a philosopher friend of the truth of Christianity by philosophical arguments so as not to produce a pseudo-conversion.

By far the most common reaction, however, is lively interest, especially among young people, in what might be right and what might be wrong with philosophy. Specifically I am asked whether a Christian may choose philosophy as an academic career. Does not the Biblical warning "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ" (Colossians 2:8) totally rule out philosophy as a legitimate Christian pursuit?

Strictly and literally interpreted this Biblical warning is not against philosophy per se but against anyone's using it to draw us away from Christ. There is no question about the danger inherent in philosophy. Philosophy consists of human thought. We are commanded to bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Corinthians 10:5). We cannot avoid thinking; we must continually think, as we must eat, drink or do whatever we do to the glory of God (1 Corinthians 10:31). Yes, there is danger in philosophy, as there is danger in eating, drinking or any human activity. The danger is our becoming subtly or openly "spoiled" away from Christ in supposed autonomy. This is ultimately and fundamentally deadly — like a branch cutting itself from its tree and root (cf. John 15:1-6): "For in Him (Christ) dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power" (Colossians 2:9-10). We who are in Christ cannot receive anything from supposedly autonomous philosophy. On the contrary, supposedly autonomous philosophy produces whatever in it is valid because it is actually subject to and dependent upon Christ, the head of all things whatever.

Now philosophy tacitly or openly claiming autonomy and independence apart from Christ is simply human speculative thought cut loose of any "given" starting point. Its "starting point" is each individual thinker. Therefore the thorniest problem of self-proclaimed autonomous philosophy is the validation of its starting point with all philosophical implications of that starting point. This is apparent already when the overall definition of "philosophy" is attempted. Consider the following dictionary entry:

phi-los-o-phy: 1a. Love and pursuit of wisdom by intellectual means and moral self-discipline. b. The investigation of causes and laws underly-

ing reality c. Any system of philosophical inquiry or demonstration. 2. Inquiry into the nature of things based on logical reasoning rather than empirical methods. 3. The critique and analysis of fundamental beliefs as they come to be conceptualized and formalized. 4. The synthesis of all learning. 5. In archaic and historical use, the investigation of natural phenomena and its systematization in theory and experiment, as in alchemy, astrology, or astronomy; *hermetic philosophy*, *natural philosophy*. 6. All learning except technical precepts and practical arts. 7. All the disciplines presented in university curriculums of science and the liberal arts, except medicine, law and theology; *Doctor of Philosophy*. 8. The science comprising logic, ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, and epistemology. 9. Any system of motivating concepts or principles; *the philosophy of a culture*. 10. A basic theory; a viewpoint; *an original philosophy of advertising*. 11. The system of values by which one lives. 12. The calmness, equanimity, and detachment thought to befit a philosopher.

By this cluster of definitions all of us are philosophers! Even "archaic" philosophy in the form of astrology (definition 5) is still very much with us. The non-academic definitions of philosophy (9-12) need not now concern us. In our discussion of the foundation and validation of philosophy as an academic discipline we may, I think, limit ourselves to definitions 1b. through 4, and 6 through 8. These partially overlap and also partially contradict each other. They provoke instant questions, such as whether "fundamental belief" (definition 3) is not more than its conceptualization and formalization, thus introducing reductionism from the start, or whether the notion of "science" (definition 9) is identical to "science" in an empirical sense or stands itself in need of definition for philosophical purposes. A student of philosophy soon realizes that the most comprehensive and accurate definition of academic philosophy is "Always question everything."

A good Biblical definition of inquiry is the apostle Paul's exhortation, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (I Thessalonians 5:21). Philosophy attempts to obey the first part of this exhortation. But it neither can nor does "hold fast that which is good." It has no one evaluative standard by which it can determine once and for all (that is, "hold fast") what counts as "good." For since philosophy is speculative human thought starting with each would-be autonomous thinker, who will decide which thought is "better" than another thought? We know that it is not a question of majority decision either. Further, it is the philosopher's task, by definition, to question, not to establish the validity or "goodness" of anything. In short, philosophy cannot guide positively; it can at best raise doubt and further reflection.

In addition, philosophical inquiry is vitiated by the flux or change observed in all visible entities in time. Some philosophies claim that this flux or change is all there is to the universe; as Heraclitus reputedly put it, "You can't bathe in the same river twice." Other philosophies postulate a substance of absolute, unchanging "being" behind or beneath the visible, changing, "becoming" world. But if naturalistic, random evolution in a self-existent, self-contained universe as proclaimed by Darwin and his heirs be sufficient to account for the present universe, then not only the creator of the Bible but also any philoso-

phical notions of a "first cause", an "unmoved Mover", a law of (permanent, absolute) identity and related aprioristic concepts are not merely superfluous but false. A command to "hold fast that which is good" can then at best serve us only for short periods of time under conditions of minimal change, and only in a relative, not an absolute sense. For nothing in a self-existent, self-contained evolutionist world of universal flux can possibly be "good" absolutely, once and for all, unalterably — because in such a world nothing *is* once and for all.

It seems to me that as long as some notion of a Creator, unchanging "being", and the like still hovers in the background of human speculative thought, philosophy can still give the illusion to its practitioners and the general public that eventually its perpetually questioning inquiry may provide real answers or an answer. The answer(s) would be reached by elimination. Philosophers have done their questioning for thousands of years, and seemingly got no further. But some day only the notion or notions impervious to philosophical questioning may be left over as "true." However, on evolutionist assumptions of universal and perpetual change this illusion cannot be consistently maintained.

Once the epistemological vacuum entailed by evolutionist premises is recognized and acknowledged by philosophers, they might ask whether it is worth going on with their questioning. They might reply that man being a speculative thinker cannot help going on questioning even though aware that he will never get answers. They might reply that the philosophical analysis of temporary, relative, transient problems will keep them busy enough. And anyway, philosophical brainstorming sessions are fun!

To some academicians "doing philosophy," however, going on and on with incessant questioning and arguing after realizing that no issue ever can or will be settled by this method may become unbearable. A deeper cause for disenchantment with philosophy is that analytical investigation cannot lead to knowledge of the subject under investigation. This is so because the very act of analysis destroys the subject which is being analyzed, for "analysis" means cutting the subject apart so its smaller segments may be examined separately. The philosophical critique of a subject resulting from the analytical method is actually not a critique of the subject as it really is, but of an artifact first torn apart by analysis and then reassembled as seems best.

The set of opinions and values held by the philosopher is a further source of falsification. Since philosophy apart from Christ is simply the would-be autonomous speculative thought of men, any knowledge it purports to convey is inextricably tied to the particular "bias" of the individual human inquirer. Furthermore, in addition to the subjective emphasis or "blik" of the philosopher there is the problem of built-in reductionism in approaching the problem. We asked earlier whether "fundamental belief" might not be more than its conceptualization and formalization. Deliberate exclusion of this or that aspect of a problem is not the only difficulty, however. Philosophy — would-be autonomous human speculative thought — fails as a method of acquiring knowledge not merely by reason of using analysis, but also because human beings are not omniscient. Inevitably bits and pieces of a philosophical problem or puzzle elude the human inquirer. Therefore any and all answers of

autonomous human thought are not merely relative, tentative and temporary but of necessity contain a built-in error of incompleteness.

As a matter of fact, autonomous philosophy, having no absolute, "given" starting point, cannot even make assertions of temporary, relative, probable "truth." St. Augustine stated the reason well almost fifteen hundred years ago in *Contra Academicos*; he pointed out the foolishness of academicians claiming to assert approximate or probable truth when they do not know what absolute, certain truth is to begin with. He illustrated this by the obvious deceptiveness of the statement that a man looks like his father if the person making the statement has never seen the father and has no idea what the father looks like. What reliability can be placed in any philosophical statement whatever if on the would-be autonomous thinker's own premises nothing whatever is to be taken as absolutely, certainly, once-and-for-all "true?" Not only has the philosopher never seen the "father" — he claims the "father" can never be seen by philosophers' eyes. On modern evolutionist premises the case is even worse, for not only can the "father" never be seen, there is no "father." To go on "doing philosophy" (apart from Christ) under these circumstances requires, I believe, a peculiar kind of stoicism or a peculiar kind of addiction. For ultimately the epistemologically informed and consistent autonomous philosopher must doubt also the validity of his own doubt.

What conclusions can be drawn by Christians from all this? First of all, we who are in Christ find our starting point in Christ Who is our Alpha and Omega. We who "have the mind of Christ" judge or discern all things (I Corinthians 2:12-16). Our thought is not would-be autonomous and speculative but desires total conformity with Christ, the Word of God, our epistemological root. Therefore, because we start with "captivity to Christ," we may confidently expect abiding results in our inquiry. It is not such a paradox after all: the branch which is cut off from its tree and root may seem "free" but is doomed to sterility and disintegration. The branch abiding, or regrafted, into the tree seems "captive" but it alone bears fruit. We, who have met Christ the Truth and know what He looks like, have the right to assert approximate or probable truth. Our very tentativity or doubt is permeated with the justified hope that though we ourselves may not have answers or be in error, there is an answer. The observed flux and temporal change of this world does not invalidate our starting point — the Personal, Timeless and Changeless Creator Himself in Person Whose very name is "I AM" (Exodus 3:14). The end for us is the abolition of all doubt and all uncertainty whatever in the Revelation and total reign of Christ.

Therefore Christians have every right to challenge the would-be autonomous academicians of this world. As C.S. Lewis puts it, "good philosophy must exist, if for no other reason, because bad philosophy needs to be answered."¹ We need to challenge especially contemporary evolutionist philosophies on the grounds of their epistemological bankruptcy due to their wilful rejection of the Personal Creator-God of the Bible. This is being done very successfully by Henry Morris, Francis Schaeffer, Josh McDowell or R.C. Sproul, to name but a few. They have immeasurable influence especially among college students who have realized, as did my burnt-out agnostic friend mentioned at the start of this paper, that autonomous philosophy simply has no answers whatever.²

Of course a Christian may have to turn his back on the entire autonomous

philosophical enterprise once he sees that further discussion would be mere "striving about words to no profit" (2 Timothy 2:14), either with a particular person (when the Christian has said all God put on his heart and mind, with no more to be added), or else because the academic "establishment" of his particular locality or institution would pressure or compel him to at least outward conformity with human autonomous thought apart from Christ and its methods of inquiry and expression. To give in to such pressure would be to bow to an idol. However, a truly "pluralistic" spirit granting academic freedom also to Christians still prevails in some institutions and classrooms here and there. In addition, the Christian can use the "always question everything" motto of non-Christian autonomous philosophy to good advantage against that philosophy (remembering that his motto is but a copy of the Bible's exhortation "Prove all things"). One coming to Christ when already professionally occupied in the teaching of philosophy may certainly consider that continued service "in the calling wherein he was called" (I Corinthians 7:20) may be his appointed task under God.

A final touchstone of human autonomous thought which ought to alert both Christians and also unbelievers to its futility is its use of language. There is an enormous "language gap" between academicians "doing philosophy" and laypeople. For example the simple word "I" is loaded as upon evolutionist philosophical premises there is no meaningful "I" or "self". Evolutionist determinists have admitted that to use words like "I" or "choice" is a mere *façon de parler*. To admit that one is using language deceptively in this manner — and then to go on doing it — is unethical (see also Christ's warning in Matthew 5:37 and His terrifying warning of Matthew 12:36-37: "But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgement. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned"). Human autonomous thought, as already in Babel, results in confusion of tongues and non-communication. C.S. Lewis, himself a veteran Christian philosopher, prophetically and exultantly exclaims: "*Qui Verbum Dei contempserunt, eis auferetur etiam verbum hominis* (They that have despised the Word of God, from them shall the word of man also be taken away)."³

NOTES

- ¹ C.S. Lewis, *The Weight of Glory* (Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1965, Third Printing February 1971), 50.
- ² While Christian evangelistic efforts acknowledging the infallibility of the Scripture and in particular the creation account of Genesis are eminently successful, scholasticism or neo-Thomism with its unbiblical accommodation to Aristotelian philosophy by equating God with "Being" or "pure essence" does not carry a like impact. I find it significant that the split between the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches was due, besides the "filioque" controversy, largely to the Orthodox rejection of this impersonalization of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The Orthodox insisted and insist that God is not a philosophical concept or abstraction but rather is a *Person*.
- ³ C.S. Lewis, *That Hideous Strength* (The Macmillan Company, New York, First Macmillan Paperbacks Edition 1965, Tenth Printing 1971), 351.

The Bishop and "Darwin's Bulldog"

Edward Coleson

One of the most damaging pseudo-scientific myths to gain wide credence in the West in the last century or two is the notion that Christians should stay out of science. "Exhibit A" in the case against Christian involvement is a collection of three distorted stories which are supposed to prove to all, saint or sinner, that no good can possibly come from our mixing in where they think we don't belong. The three are the prosecution of Galileo by the Catholic Church because of his Copernican astronomy, the Huxley-Wilberforce debate at Oxford in 1860 over Darwin's new theory, and the famous "Monkey Trial" of 1925. Apparently, with good baseball-like logic, many have concluded that it was "three strikes and you're out". That being the case, the appropriate thing for the Church to do is to mind its own pious business and avoid further trouble. Many devout Christians are as much convinced of this as are the atheistic evolutionists. They may not agree with evolution, but respect the division of labor implicit in the separation of sacred and secular. In fact, they are often very uneasy when Creationists challenge the scientific establishment. They don't want to be embarrassed again. They agree the saints "should be seen and not heard."

I suspected long ago that there was more to those stories than we had been told and so there is. Anyone who wishes to examine the evidence will find a wealth of material on the first and the last of the episodes, the arraignment of Galileo before the Inquisition in 1633 and the Scopes' Case in our own time. Those who would like the other side of the trial of Galileo, perhaps with a Catholic rather than an atheistic bias, would find Jerome J. Langford's *Galileo, Science, and the Church*¹ interesting. While there is much on the "Monkey Trial", may I suggest *Darwin Retried*² by Norman Macbeth? Since the author is a lawyer, this would be a useful supplement to the usual biological discussions of the issues. While we Christians have made our share of mistakes, we have the same right to a fair hearing that secular scientists claim for themselves. Why has this been denied us?

Since the Huxley-Wilberforce debate has been the neglected aspect of the problem, it is about time that this story should be subjected to scrutiny also. Bernard Ramm's³ remark about "Bishop Wilberforce's disgraceful attack" on Huxley seems completely unwarranted when one knows the men and the circumstances. Unfortunately, Ramm's attitude in this case rather sets the tone for the entire book, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. According to Marvin Lubenow,⁴ the book went through nine printings in its first twenty years and was still being used by about twenty Bible colleges as a text. In addition to its success over here, twenty five thousand were printed in England. Needless to say, Ramm's pronouncements have no doubt tended to accentuate the inferiority complex of a multitude of Evangelicals and have

Edward Coleson receives his mail at Box 32, Spring Arbor, MI 49283.

encouraged them to keep quiet about scientific questions. Since several generations of Christians have felt ashamed of the Bishop's lack of tact or wisdom, let us try to see what actually happened on that momentous occasion.

First, we need to correct a few misunderstandings. One would assume from Andrew Dickson White's massive study, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, published in 1896, that over the ages there had been nothing but conflict between scientists and Christians, with the latter always the villains of the drama. Certainly there have been problems, but it is well to remember that able scholars have concluded that modern science was a by-product of Christianity. For instance, Robert K. Merton⁵ came to this conclusion as a result of doing a doctor's dissertation on the rise of science in seventeenth-century England, although he did not begin with this hypothesis. He found that:

... educated and articulate Puritans of the seventeenth century ... took it as almost self-evident that science made not for the dethronement of God but rather provided a means of celebrating His wisdom and the tidiness of the universe He had created.

Secularization and "warfare" became factors of importance much later, but the early scientists — and not just English Puritans either — were often devout Christians. John Kepler, as just one example, felt he was " ... thinking God's thoughts after Him."

The view that Christianity and science were compatible persisted well into the lifetime of Charles Darwin in the early decades of the last century. One of the most famous exponents of this doctrine was William Paley, an Anglican clergyman who wrote a book which was a favorite of young Darwin. He said: "I do not think I hardly ever admired a book more than Paley's *Natural Theology*. I could almost formerly have said it by heart."⁶ Paley's approach to the Creation question was the "design argument". He used the example of finding a watch by the pathway which, he said, would be indisputable proof of the existence of a watchmaker, although the universe is infinitely more complicated than a mere timepiece. This reasoning so impressed his contemporaries that \$48,000 was left to the Royal Society⁷ to carry out research in the various fields of science to show the marvels of God's handiwork. Darwin⁸ was very conscious that he had to demolish such thinking to make way for his theory of evolution. As he wrote, "Such doctrines, if true, would be absolutely fatal to my theory." Coming as a stark contrast with the pious endeavors of the scientists of the preceding era, the publication of *The Origin of Species* was more of a shock in 1859 than its equivalent would be today.

Another bit of background we need to understand the debate at Oxford in 1860 is an introduction to the Bishop himself. This was not needed then: everyone knew the Bishop and his father before him too. Samuel, "Soapy Sam" as he was derisively nicknamed, was the third son of William Wilberforce, the great English abolitionist to whom John Wesley wrote his last letter before he died in 1791. He was then a young politician, an exceedingly clever one too. William had only recently been converted under the guidance of John Newton, the author of "Amazing Grace". Newton, an ungodly slave-trading sea captain, was a celebrity in his own right also. After his conversion he became a preacher and hymn writer. Under the influence of such men as Newton and Wesley, Wilberforce⁹ decided to devote his political talents to the abolition of slavery, the "holy cause" which had gripped the Evangelical

conscience and imagination about that time. Since powerful vested interests fought the anti-slavery movement every step of the way, William Wilberforce was controversial and very well known. Although he had been dead for more than twenty-five years in 1860, he had not been forgotten. Samuel, his son, had attracted a good deal of attention himself also. Whereas the traditional bishops of Oxford had been wont to drive into town with a coach and four horses, plus two powdered footmen, Bishop Wilberforce¹⁰ mounted a horse and rode in by himself. While this shocked the older generation, a good many people liked their colorful new prelate. The Bishop got into politics too — less of a scandal then than now — and angered the great landlords, but pleased a lot of ordinary folks. Sam was controversial and conspicuous, like his father.

It is well to remember also that Darwin's new theory had not become "a basic fact" yet in 1859, an unwarranted assumption that C. S. Lewis¹¹ strongly objected to in his essay, "The Funeral of a Great Myth". It was still open to question. Darwin himself mentioned a third of the way through his book that "... a crowd of difficulties will have occurred" to the reader by that time and confessed that "to this day I can hardly reflect on them without being in some degree staggered ...". His puzzle at this point was why we "... do not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being ... well defined?"¹² Much later in the book he allows that the "sudden appearance of groups of allied species" in the fossil record is a serious problem.¹³ In other words, he was much less arrogant than the evolutionists discussed by Lewis in his essay. There is a tendency also for the "true believers" to imagine that *The Origin of Species* emerged rather spontaneously from Darwin's extensive contact with nature, the voyage of the Beagle around the world (1831-1836) and his other researches. This is not true either. As James B. Conant,¹⁴ former president of Harvard University, reminded us, Darwin himself said that while reading Malthus, "... the idea of natural selection suddenly rose to my mind." One could ask if Malthus was right and this question raises more problems. In other words, evolution, like any other philosophical system, was built on certain basic assumptions and was not a self-evident truth. Since Darwinism has become another religion in the modern era, its faith commitments are rarely examined, certainly not by evolutionary fanatics, but this was not true in 1860. The new theory was still on trial.

The Origin of Species came from the press in late November, 1859. Although the publisher thought it would never sell, it was an instant success; a second edition was printed at once. Why it became a bestseller is still a bit of a mystery; even Huxley¹⁵ said that after thirty years of reading it he still considered it "... one of the hardest books to understand thoroughly I know of." Henry Adams¹⁶ said he became an evolutionist because everyone else was doing it, although he confessed he really didn't understand the theory. Evidently a lot of other people accepted it on faith also. Needless to say, not everyone was willing to take up with the new fashion, so there was much discussion of *The Origin* that winter and spring in England.

The climax of the controversy over evolution came on Saturday, June 30, 1860, at the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Oxford. Actually, the debate between Bishop Wilberforce and Thomas Huxley came as a rather informal exchange between them after one of the scholarly papers was read. It was a matter of popular demand as the

audience called for them to express their views. It was not entirely unpremeditated, however; Wilberforce had been coached by a scientist although he wasn't one himself. The Bishop spoke first and was no doubt eloquent, but he made the mistake of ending his talk by asking Huxley whether it was "through your grandfather or your grandmother that you claim your descent from ■ monkey?" Everybody laughed and then Huxley made his reply. He said he would not be ashamed to have a monkey for a grandfather, but he would be "ashamed to be connected with ■ man who used great gifts to obscure the truth." That witty rejoinder brought down the house and the world has been laughing at us Creationists ever since. William Irvine¹⁷ used this story as the introduction to his *Apes, Angels, and Victorians* and this is the usual version of the debate. The scholarly biography¹⁸ of the Huxley family tells us that "The details of what Huxley said differ as much as do those of Wilberforce's speech." Since neither was written down, the differences are to be expected, but the essentials are obviously the same: Wilberforce made a clever but unscientific talk and ended it with a flippant remark, and then Huxley turned the joke back on the Bishop. The notion that we should be ashamed of this "disgraceful attack", as urged by Bernard Ramm, is a little ridiculous. After all, Huxley was well able to defend himself and this little interchange made him an international celebrity. Few people have ever reaped such great profits from so small an investment of time and energy.

One can only speculate on what would have happened if Darwin had been at Oxford himself to defend his own theory. He was home sick again; he usually was. Robert E. D. Clark¹⁹ believes that:

Darwin's trouble almost certainly lay in the suppression of his religious needs. His life was one long attempt to escape from Paley, to escape from the church, to escape from God.

Therefore, although he wrote *The Origin of Species*, Huxley, as "Darwin's Bulldog", was the one who led the fight to get evolution accepted as "basic fact". When Christians opposed Huxley, he was not always as gracious as we are expected to be to evolutionists. When Bishop Wilberforce was thrown from his horse and killed in 1873, Huxley²⁰ commented that "... reality and his brains came into contact and the result was fatal" — ■ remark perhaps less kind under the circumstances than the Bishop's "disgraceful attack" on him in 1860. Huxley continued his fight over the years. There were other churchmen to quarrel with too and he even took on the great Victorian Prime Minister, William E. Gladstone, himself. He also declared war on the Salvation Army²¹, when he "... suddenly realized with horror that he had discovered a grave national danger" in that organization. "Apparently, the older and tired he grew, the harder he fought," as Irvine said.

Huxley's closing years provide ■ tantalizing puzzle that still defies explanation. In 1893 he was asked to deliver the Romanes Lecture at Oxford. He had not spoken at the University since his confrontation with Wilberforce a third of ■ century earlier. His theme was "Evolution and Ethics" and, while he talked about Indian religion, the Greek Stoics, and the problems of the ages, he seemed to be saying, according to Jacques Barzun,²² that evolution

... was ■ dangerous guide to human action. The ethical process must supplement it ... Cooperation and love, the Sermon on the Mount, were the more successful, the more "scientific" ways of life.

A whole generation had grown up on evolution since "Soapy Sam" had protested against Darwinism so long ago. Huxley now found himself in about

the same position that the Bishop was in back in 1860. The text of his speech, if read with any care, revealed that he had not turned Fundamentalist. But people in general do not weigh words that carefully, so this address seemed to be an anticlimax to his long fight for evolution. Had he turned religious in his old age, the consequence of senility, or had he finally gotten some sense? The earthly answer to that question depends on who is doing the judging; we cannot speak for the "Judge of all the Earth". There is a familiar story that when Darwin lay dying in 1882, more than a decade earlier than this, that he renounced his evolutionary views, but Wilbert H. Rusch²³ has made a careful study of existing evidence and has concluded the narrative was probably wishful thinking, perhaps growing out of Mrs. Darwin's efforts to put the best possible construction on her husband's demise. We can only hope that both men finally saw the light.

Whatever the appropriate interpretation of Huxley's "Evolution and Ethics" and the truth about Darwin's final hours, there has been a growing conviction across the earth that scientific materialism is not an adequate moral guide and we need to make the most of this change. "There is a tide in the affairs of men," as Shakespeare told us long ago. An apologetic Evangelicalism, weighed down with guilt for sins we did not commit, is not prepared to take advantage of our present opportunities. We need to be advancing on every front. Like Joshua and Caleb long ago: "Let us go up at once and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it" (Numbers 13:30).

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Jerome J. Langford, *Galileo, Science and the Church* (Ann Arbor: the University of Michigan Press, 1971), pp. 133-158.
- ² Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried* (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1971), p. 5.
- ³ Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), p. 260.
- ⁴ Marvin L. Lubenow, "Progressive Creationism, Is it a Biblical Option?" (Proceedings of the Third Creation Science Conference 1976), p. 61.
- ⁵ Robert K. Merton, *Science, Technology, and Society in Seventeenth-century England* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970), p. xvi.
- ⁶ Macbeth, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
- ⁷ A. Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1944), pp. 7-9.
- ⁸ Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* (New York: P. F. Collier and Son, the Harvard Classics, vol. 11), pp. 209-211.
- ⁹ R. Coupland, *Wilberforce, a Narrative* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968 reprint of original published in 1923 by Clarendon Press), pp. 32-94.
- ¹⁰ Reginald Wilberforce, *Life of Samuel Wilberforce* (New York: Anson D.F. Randolph and Co., 1889), pp. 77-92.
- ¹¹ C. S. Lewis, *Christian Reflections* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), pp. 82-93.
- ¹² Darwin, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

- ¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 354-363.
- ¹⁴ James Bryant Conant, *Two Modes of Thought: My Encounters with Science and Education* (New York: Trident Press, 1964), pp. 28-31.
- ¹⁵ Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx and Wagner: Critique of a Heritage* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958), pp. 32 and 74.
- ¹⁶ Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (New York: Random House, Modern Library edition, 1931), pp. 224-232.
- ¹⁷ William Irvines, *Apes, Angels, and Victorians: the Story of Darwin, Huxley and Evolution* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955), pp. 3-8.
- ¹⁸ Ronald W. Clark, *The Huxleys* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968), pp. 55-59.
- ¹⁹ Robert E. D. Clark, *Darwin: Before and After* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1966), pp. 82-85.
- ²⁰ Ronald W. Clark, *op cit.*, p. 117.
- ²¹ Irvine, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-330.
- ²² Barzun, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-104.
- ²³ Wilbert H. Rusch, Sr., "Darwin's Last Hours," (*Creation Research Society Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 2; Sept., 1975), pp. 99-102.

The Pivotal Importance of Dinosaurs in Creationist and Evolutionist Thought

Lorella Rouster

For years the evolutionists have controlled publications, the media and education so completely that their assumptions about dinosaurs and dragons were freely and nearly universally stated as fact. Recently, creationists have been challenging these assumptions. But many wonder why we bother. Of what importance are these distinctions? What difference do they make? Why don't creationists use their time for things more important? These are all questions that arise again and again as I discuss with believers and unbelievers my writing and speaking on this topic.

They are legitimate questions. If this is only a peripheral topic of little consequence, if this is only a question of curiosity and not of real urgency, why bother with it, when so much else cries for attention? I believe the framework in which we interpret dinosaurs and dragons is vitally important for four main reasons.

First, dinosaurs in contact with human beings fits into the Creation-Flood model of origins, but *not* into the evolutionary model. According to Genesis, water animals were created on the fifth day (Gen. 1:21-23), land animals, man and woman on the sixth day (Gen. 1:24-25). At most, dinosaurs and the first people were created but one day apart, assuming dinosaurs are basically water-based creatures. In fact, many feel that the "great whales" of the King James Version (Gen. 1:21) may be an inclusive or broad term meaning great sea creatures, and may easily take in water-based dinosaurs such as the Sauropods.¹ On the other hand, the concept of dinosaurs existing long before humans fits into the evolutionary, but *not* the Creation model of origins and prehistory. This in itself should be reason enough for creationists to be interested, even aside from simple scientific inquiry.

The second reason this topic is important is that evidence of dinosaurs in contact with humans constitutes evidence *for* the Biblical model of prehistory, and evidence *against* the evolutionary model. According to evolutionary theory, dinosaurs evolved in the Mesozoic Era, 65 to 225 million years ago,² and people did not evolve until the last part of the Quaternary, about 250,000 years ago.³ It is true that Richard Leakey's recent discoveries of human fossils in Africa have been dated at three million years,⁴ but this has not caused evolutionists to examine either the assumption of evolution or the pre-suppositions involved in radiometric dating. Probably the timetable of "evolution" will get pushed back further and further by evolutionists, for as Harold Slusher points out, the age of the earth has been doubling every fifteen years for the past 300 years.⁵ But the idea that humans and dinosaurs coexisted disturbs evolutionary ideas, which require vast eons of time in which it is

Lorella Rouster receives her mail at Box K, Fremont, IN 46737.

thought that the unthinkable somehow becomes reality. All the evidence that humans saw dinosaurs, for instance, the drawing of a dinosaur on the cave wall at Latrone, France, the inclusion of the dragon (dinosaur) in the Chinese zodiac with eleven real, known animals, and pictures by the early cultures of Babylon, Assyria, Iran, the Vikings and the Mayan Indians, all this is evidence that vast evolutionary expanses of time did not separate dinosaurs and early humanity. Even if the upper portion of the evolutionary time scale should be revised to show dinosaurs and humans closer together in time, we may ask, If such major revisions are needed in the supposedly more recent part about which we know the most, what vast revisions are likely needed in the supposedly more ancient part, where the guesswork REALLY begins?

The third reason this subject is important is that for years, we've been giving away much of the evidence to support our case! By giving dinosaurs in literature, folklore and art a separate name, dragons, and then by relegating such creatures to myth or explaining their physical reality away in some psychological way such as Carl Sagan and Peter Dickinson attempt to do,⁶ we lose much of the evidence to support our case. It is true that we still have some paleontological evidence, for instance, the footprints of brontosauri and people together in the Paluxy River bed at Glen Rose, Texas⁷. This is sufficient to prove to the open-minded that people co-existed with dinosaurs. But scientists often say that if evidence can be adduced from a variety of disciplines, it lends great weight to the veracity of a hypothesis. By allowing the dragons of ancient art, folklore and literature to be relegated to the realm of superstition or the world of dreams, we have given away substantial evidence from many disciplines that confirms the findings of paleontology and points us in the direction of these early inhabitants of the earth living at the same time, as described in Genesis and Job. By failing to recognize Behemoth and Leviathan (Job 40 and 41) as describing dinosaurs, we have also given away the evidence recorded in the Bible that the early writers of Scripture were familiar with dinosaurs. Whoever heard of a lawyer giving half his evidence to his opponent? This topic is important because creationists must recognize what we have unwittingly done, and must recover the evidence we have given to our adversaries.

The fourth reason this topic is so urgent is that by teaching the assumption that dinosaurs lived long before humans, even if evolution itself is not specifically mentioned in that teaching, the student is moved toward accepting evolution. The propagandists who write many of our children's books on this subject know that at some future date the student will need to fit what he has been taught about dinosaurs into a framework of origins and prehistory, a philosophy of time. The only framework he can possibly fit it into is evolution; the only philosophy it is compatible with is humanism. This is why early teaching about dinosaurs, often done as early as first grade, is so critical⁸. This teaching, however simple and innocent it may appear, if it suggests the idea that dinosaurs lived long before humans, forms the first link of a chain that is being woven into the minds of our youth. This chain has a key for the addition of future links. No part of the Creation-Flood model of prehistory will fit onto this chain. Evolution is the key that fits other links onto the chain, leading the student eventually to the acceptance of evolution and a humanistic view of the world. Why have we not had greater success in teaching Creation in our Sunday schools? Perhaps one major reason is that our youth already have the first link of the evolutionary chain in their minds from early teaching that dinosaurs lived long before humans evolved. This link, once established,

resists the addition of the truths of Creation. It is urgent and imperative that we break this chain!

The student who has this first evolutionary link in his mind has only one option short of rejecting Creation altogether. This option is to accept Creation and evolution both, attempting somehow to segment truth about the early earth into "religious" and "scientific" (meaning evolutionary) realms. This is a popular way of coping with the problem, and results in fragmented thinking about the world in which "truth" arrived at in different disciplines is not only not harmonized with "truth" from others, but in which contradictory "truths" are both thought to be equally true at the same time. This has given a tremendous boost to the rise of modern existentialism. The person whose thought is so fragmented is actually further from finding the truth than the out-and-out evolutionist who says Creation and the Flood are bunk. At least the out-and-out evolutionist recognizes that there must be a framework of thought that "puts it all together", even though he has missed that framework. The original evolutionary link, then, is very dangerous.

How can we recover our forfeited evidence for Creation? How can we break the evolutionary chain in the minds of our youth? We must become more vocal. We must write intelligent, documented letters of concern and rebuttal to book publishers, television producers, museum directors and others who insist on forging the first link of the evolutionary chain without giving equal exposure to the evidence for the other view. We must politely but firmly confront our educators with the facts. We must carefully teach our own children to discern the attempts of the enemy to force into their minds that first link, and we must diligently create the first link of Creation, of dinosaurs and humans coexisting, long before the evolutionist can begin his propaganda. Many excellent books are coming out on this topic, available from Creation publishers and at Christian bookstores. We must purchase them for our homes, read them ourselves and to our children, share them with friends. Every Creationist should purchase copies as he is able, to donate to local libraries and schools around him.

Did dinosaurs and early humans live at the same time? The topic is far from a side issue. Let's not only break the evolutionary chain; let's also forge the chain that is strong, not by virtue of popularity, but by virtue of truth.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ The Hebrew word is tannin, and according to *Ellicott's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971), means any "long" creature, and is used elsewhere of crocodiles and sea monsters in general. The NASV translates tannin "great sea monsters," and the NIV "great creatures of the sea."
- ² *These United States* (Pleasantville, New York: Reader's Digest Association, 1968), p. 122.
- ³ *The Epic of Man* (New York: Time-Life, 1961), p. 11. According to this book the genus Homo emerged about 700,000 years ago, and Homo Sapiens (Thinking Man) about 250,000 years ago. The evolution of early primates to Homo Sapiens is said to represent 700 millions years of evolution.
- ⁴ Duane T. Gish, Ph.D., *The Origin of Man*, (Bridgeport, IL: Christian Audio Tapes, 1976).

- ⁵ Harold S. Slusher, *The Age of the Earth I* (Bridgeport, IL: Christian Audio Tapes, 1976).
- ⁶ Carl Sagan, *The Dragons of Eden*, Speculates on the Evolution of Human Intelligence (New York: Random House, 1977). Peter Dickinson, *The Flight of Dragons* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979).
- ⁷ John D. Morris, *The Paluxy River Tracks*, ICR Impact Series No. 35 (San Diego: Institute for Creation Research, May 1976).
- ⁸ My own daughter encountered this in first grade in a public school in Indiana. I have observed many dinosaur books for children in variety stores, all based on evolutionary assumptions and obviously aimed at very early ages.

Muggeridge on Evolution

I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books in the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has. I think I spoke to you before about this age as one of the most credulous in history, and I would include evolution as an example. I'm very happy to say I live near a place called Piltown. I like to drive there because it gives me a special glow. You probably know that a skull was discovered there and no less than five hundred doctoral theses were written on the subject and then it was discovered that the skull was a practical joke by a worthy dentist in Hastings who'd hurriedly put a few bones together, not even from the same animal, and buried them and stirred up all this business.

— *Malcolm Muggeridge*

Conflict-Action-Growth Vs. Rest in God

An Appraisal of John Dewey from the Biblical Creation Perspective (Part III)

Ellen Myers

CONTENTS

Part I (contained in the Winter 1980 issue)

Introduction

Dewey's Life

Dewey's Organizational Involvement

Dewey and Communism

Dewey's Religion: Pietism, Liberal Protestantism, Atheism

Part II (contained in the Spring 1981 issue)

Dewey's Philosophy

A. Dealing with Truth

B. Activity versus Rest

Part III (contained in the present issue)

"The Quest for Uncertainty"

A. Evolutionist, Lawless, Monistic Continuity and Process Philosophy

B. Can You "Just Lie Back On It"?

C. "The Quest for Uncertainty"

Summary and Conclusion

Bibliography

"THE QUEST FOR UNCERTAINTY"

A. Evolutionist Lawless Monistic Continuity and Process Philosophy

Dewey's ostensible trouble with most classical philosophies was that they postulated a separation between the knower and the known, and thus inserted a subject-object, or on a deeper level a "being-becoming" dualism into their concept of reality. For Dewey, on the other hand "the object of knowledge in its strict sense is its objective; and this objective is not constituted till it is reached." (*Logic, The Theory of Inquiry*, 8) Much of his mature thought is given over to attack what he termed (first, I think, in his *Quest for Certainty*, page 23) the "spectator theory of knowledge." Rushdoony in his scathing demolition of Dewey as the father of "progressive education" also demolishes the idea that thinkers who deny immutable truth in the God of the Bible and His self-revelation have no fixed assumptions of their own. He points out that

Dewey the pragmatist was more firmly wedded to eternal verities than many a metaphysician. . . . For him there were hard and fast truths that were beyond dissent or discussion, presupposed as the very ground

of his thinking . . .

First of all, Dewey, as a good Hegelian to the last, assumed without question the truth of the *concept of continuity*. Any dualistic system was by definition false; 'science' required a continuous reality and a oneness of being that made for ■ necessary equalization of all being. (Rushdoony, 145)

This need not mean, of course, that for Dewey or pragmatists-empiricists at large monistic, self-existing and self-evolving naturalist reality need "hang together" so to speak in an all-embracing system or order such as cause-and-effect. Remember, *randomness* (and not teleology) is the hallmark of Darwinian evolution which inspired Dewey. Krikorian, who greatly admires Dewey and all modern philosophical process thinkers, points out that for them

Reality is conceived with all its discontinuities and loose connections, rather than as a completely integrated system where all relations are internal and form ■ network of unbroken implications. (Krikorian, 3)

For Dewey, ■ process philosopher par excellence, Krikorian says, quoting Dewey, "growing, or continuous reconstruction of experience is the only end to life." (Krikorian, 4). Elsewhere Dewey repeats this thought, "Growth itself is the only moral end," (*Reconstruction in Philosophy*. NY: Henry Holt & Co., 1926, 177; quoted in Krikorian, 10). Krikorian expresses the attractiveness of this monistic all-is-one but yet also free-wheeling, randomly put-together and hence essentially lawless world conceived by the process philosopher:

The process philosophy is a forward-looking one, centered upon possibilities. The emphasis is on adventure, on new ways of living, on new social institutions, on new civilizations. Its motive for progress is not merely release from misery, but the love of change, of novelty, of abundance. In process philosophies the lure of ideal possibilities is the dormant theme. Even "god" (sic) is defined as the union of all ideal possibilities arousing men to action. For the Thomist, being is good, for the process philosopher becoming is good. (Krikorian, 5)

Krikorian cites a most significant statement written by Dewey at the age of thirty-five:

As far back as his *The Study of Ethics, A Syllabus*, written in 1894, (Dewey) expressed his conviction that amid the prevalence of "pathological and moralistic ethics, there is room for ■ theory which conceives of conduct as the normal and free living of life as it is." (Krikorian, 7)

Krikorian concludes:

In its fundamentals Dewey's ethical theory is one of the most vital and relevant philosophies of conduct in contemporary thought. Grounded in human experience and natural events, it is an ethics exhilaratingly free from extra-empirical or super-naturalistic dogmas. (Krikorian, 12)

It was about that time that (Hegelian) "idealist theories were disappearing from (Dewey's) writings" (White, xiv) and we "find him calling himself an 'experimental idealist' in 1894" (ibid.)

. . . whatever idealist ideas remained were expressed in the sober tones of Darwinian naturalism. For instance, the idealistic belief that norms or standards are never imposed on existence *ab extra* is given new content in his paper "Evolution and Ethics." (*Monist*, VIII (1898), 321-341.) It is no longer expressed by saying that the real is rational, but rather by a detailed argument to show ideals themselves arise out of

natural situations. . . . This desire to locate the standard of thinking within the natural process is, in part, what motivated Dewey's construction of an instrumental logic. (White, xv)

Dykhuizen in discussing Dewey's essay "From Absolutism to Experimentalism" in which Dewey himself describes his philosophical transition, sums up Dewey's underlying thought as follows: "Dewey sensed that a valid metaphysics would picture reality as unified, its several parts interdependent and functionally related. The model he had in mind was the biological (human) organism (suggested by Huxley's *Elements of Physiology*).'" (Dykhuizen, 17).

Hendrik Hart, the Christian scholar ranking Dewey with "Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and Kant" (Hart, 8) has traced the genesis of Dewey's expressed evolutionary monist thought with patient scholarship to an essay by Dewey, "The Logic of Verification" which appeared in the April 24, 1880 issue of *The Open Court*. Hart quotes Dewey as follows:

. . . If the idea, the hypothesis needs extension, transformation and verification, the 'facts' in their turn, are in need of enlargement, alteration and significance . . . if the theory gets its verification through the facts, the facts get a transformed and enlarged meaning through the theory. I do not mean simply that the theory leads to the discovery of new facts . . .

. . . Both idea and 'facts' are flexible, and verification is the process of mutual adjustment, of organic interaction. . . .

. . . And there is no other test of a theory than this, its ability to work . . . (*The Open Court*, "The Logic of Verification, 2227) (Hart, 15).

"Here," Hart continues, "suddenly and unannounced . . . there is a presentation in a nutshell of the well-known later Dewey. Here is first of all the doctrine of test through operational consequences, the 'ability to work' of Pragmatism which can not be found in any previous publication. Secondly, here we find the beginning of the organic interaction. . . . the transaction approach . . ." (ibid.)

While Hart may have ranked Dewey too highly, he gives him credit where credit is due, namely, for Dewey's consistency with evolutionism in his monism. This is a point which must be emphasized in the present paper written from the biblical creation perspective. Hart states, and I wholeheartedly agree:

Some people with a dualistic cosmology who deny the original unity and the natural continuity so basic to an adherent of evolutionism, believe that it is nevertheless possible to be an evolutionist and a dualist. Such inconsistency does not appear in Dewey's philosophy, for he is in direct keeping with the Darwinian tradition also in his cosmology. (Hart, 16).

Copleston shows how Dewey's concept of knowledge fits into this monistic world view: "According to Dewey, primary or immediate experience . . . contains 'no division between act and material, subject and object, but contains them both in an unanalyzed totality.' (*Experience and Nature*, p. 8) . . . knowledge is represented as being itself a doing or making rather than, as in the so-called spectator theory, a 'seeing.' " (Copleston, 115, 116)

B. Can You "Just Lie Back On It"?

The foregoing descriptions of Dewey's thought were given to substantiate the following points:

- (1) the centrality of continuity or oneness of all reality in his thought ;
- (2) the random or lawless "discontinuities" within that overall continuity in his "organic interaction," transaction or functional approach to reality;
- (3) circumvention of the subject-object dichotomy of traditional philosophies by positing the emergence of mind from matter as one chance product of naturalist, monist, random evolutionist processes; and
- (4) the felt effect of these concepts as providing for man an adventurous progress toward ideal possibilities "exhilaratingly free from extra-empirical or super-natural dogmas" where he can freely live "life as it is."

All these points depend upon the non-existence of the supernatural, sovereign, personal, all-knowing, all-sustaining and all-ruling God of the Bible and the denial of the world's origin by His creation *ex nihilo*. If this God exists, then

(1) there is of necessity discontinuity between God and creation, between man as the creature *sui generis* specifically made in God's image and likeness and all other creatures, and between all identifiable entities/creatures. There is

(2) no randomness whatever in the world, because whatever happens can and does happen only by God's directive or permissive will. In particular, the timing — the beginning and the end — of all things is His prerogative because He knows, sustains and rules all things, being "beginning and end" Himself. (Rev. 22:13)

(3) Biblical creation is the opposite of evolutionist emergence of anything from anything else including, of course, the emergence of mind from matter by naturalistic processes. But the Biblical creation perspective also disagrees with the "spectator theory of knowledge" in its various formulations implicitly or explicitly starting not with the Creator-God of the Bible, but with man himself and his mind/thought. I believe that if the God of Biblical Creation *ex nihilo* is denied as "the only true God" (John 17:3), and hence the Creator-creature discontinuity is blurred or obliterated, the singling out of man as a "knowing" subject somehow separate/discontinuous from the "known" object is, as Dewey asserts, tenable for reflection but not ultimately. I believe that post-Darwinian evolutionism in general, and Dewey in particular, have dealt the "spectator theory of knowledge" a blow from which it cannot recover. This in turn means that

(a) the presence of human reason/reality correspondence underlying applied science and unthinkable without identifiable entities in concrete actual reality presents a problem to emergent evolutionist thought at its very root, namely, *explanation of origins*;

(b) the "spectator theory of knowledge" is untenable if "God/Being" and "nature/becoming" are held to be an ontological continuum, and hence again the root problem is with *explanation of origins*;

(c) monist evolutionism in general, and Dewey's "instrumentalism" in particular, is simply a forthright and explicit as well as consistent formulation of a world which "simply exists" as a continuous whole by itself. Its *self-existence* is so to speak its "antecedent reality", and in this sense I think Georges Dicker is right in his conclusion of an intriguing monograph: "I suggest, neither Dewey's tendency to lapse into idealistic language nor his special use of 'the object of knowledge' to signify the goal of activities in which knowledge is applied should prevent us from regarding him as fundamentally a realist." (Dicker, 54).

Given the above, the ultimate conflict, then, lies between the Biblical creation perspective seeing the origin of all things in God and His creative law word, over against the monist-evolutionist perspective seeing the world as simply self-existent and reality as ongoing in continuous emergence. Unless the *supernatural*, other-than-this-world God and Creator *ex nihilo* of the Bible exists, there is no consistent alternative to the evolutionist position espoused by Dewey.

Dewey is quite right in tracing his position via Darwin to Descartes and summing up its power as follows:

When Descartes said, "The nature of physical things is much more easily conceived when they are beheld coming gradually into existence, than when they are only considered as produced at once in a finished and perfect state," the world became self-conscious of the logic . . . of which Darwin's "Origin of Species" is the latest scientific achievement . . . The influence of Darwin upon philosophy resides in his having conquered the phenomena of life for the principle of transition, and thereby freed the new logic for application to mind and morals and life. (*The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy*, 8) . . . The Darwinian principle of natural selection cut straight under this philosophy (of the design argument, the central point of theistic and idealistic philosophy) . . . (If Darwin's principle is correct, then,) there is no call for a prior intelligent causal force to plan and preordain . . . (*ibid*, 11)

Immutable "being" as an *a priori* postulate originating in or dependent upon man's own mind and thought cannot be rescued. One argument against it lies precisely in its being man's *own* postulate or assertion. How can that assertion be *independently* confirmed? If all is one — if "being" and "becoming" are a continuum — then man's mind, being part of that continuum, has no independence to confirm its own assertions about anything. The most that can be expected is probabilistic assertion — or just what Dewey said, "warranted" assertion, "truth" always asserting with its own Yea its own possible Nay. This is so of necessity because (a) the world is in constant flux in the monistic emergent evolutionist scheme and hence what is so now is not so the next moment; (b) confirmation of man's assertions by an at least equal intelligence independent of man is excluded since there is no world other than this present monistic continuous one, and hence no such independent intelligence.

So then, in the words of Dewey about his "mystic experience", "What the hell are you worrying about, anyway? Something that's here is here, and you can just lie back on it."

But can you?

"Just lying back on" that which "is here" would seem to make man the patient, not the agent, of the naturalistic evolutionist processes by which he and his intelligence emerged. Moreover, if it be true that "the object of knowledge is its objective, which is not constituted till it is reached", then of course there is strictly speaking no possibility for man to "just lie back on" anything whatever. "In final analysis, man's own action, his own life movement, is the only organ he has for receiving and appropriating truth." (Dewey, "Christianity and Democracy," quoted in Dykhuizen, 70). Continuity and flux in the random evolutionist universe demand unceasing "mutual adjustment" and "organic interaction" from man. Neither any theory nor man himself are "tested" or "validated" except by their "ability to work", both in the sense of

solving problems as in the science lab, as well as in the sense of incessant activity.

In addition, you cannot "just lie back on" what's here because as Dewey tells us "both idea and 'facts' are flexible." "There is no belief so settled," he tells us (*Logic*, 8) "as not to be exposed to further inquiry." As in the science lab, you judge the experiment by its consequences; and, further experiments considering the consequences are possible in principle ad infinitum as Dewey points out about "water as an object of science, as H_2O (which) is, because of experimental operations, an added instrumentality of multiplied controls and uses of the real things of everyday experience . . ." (*Quest*, 106)

Russell compares this instrumentalist-style inquiry to what hunger may lead you to do to an animal, "kill (it), skin it, and cook it so that . . . it is very different when it becomes food from what it was to begin with." (Schilpp, 147). This means that since all action is evaluated and hence directed by its consequence in terms of "multiplied controls and uses", then no action is done, and no entity is related to, for their own sake. Russell is quite aware of this, and so, he tells us, was Dewey:

Knowledge, if Dr. Dewey is right, cannot be any part of the ends of life; it is merely ■ means to other satisfactions . . . Dr. Dewey himself confesses to having felt this, and resisted it as a temptation. The emphasis upon the practical in his later writings, he says, "was a reaction against what was more natural, and it served as a protest and a protection against something in myself which, in the pressure of the weight of actual experience, I knew to be a weakness." (Schilpp, 155)

Russell adds:

Even those who doubt whether such asceticism is necessary either practically or theoretically, cannot but feel the highest respect for the moral force required to practice it consistently throughout a long span of years. (*ibid.*)

Never to do anything for its own sake — never to think except, according to instrumentalist credo, as "an organic adjustment to get something done" (Clark, 51) — here I think is a glimpse of hell, that everlasting restlessness of the damned. Indeed it is "more natural" to man to desire ends-in-themselves! Remember it next time you watch a glorious sunset, hug and kiss your child, long for the company of your beloved or your dear friend, or on a humbler level taste the first sip of cold water on a sweltering summer day. All these joys are but pictures or reflections of our end for which we are made, rest in and enjoyment of God. As the Westminster Shorter Catechism puts it, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever."

I do not feel respect for Dewey's "asceticism" as much as pity. He esteemed H_2O better than water, and H_2O — the instrumentalist tool — left him thirsty. Thus he literally fulfills the Scripture spoken of men forsaking God: "They have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." (Jeremiah 2:13).

When his "mystic experience", following upon his crisis involving acquaintance with Darwinian evolution, stripped him of his last vestige of caring about God, concern about his own sincerity in prayer, it freed him, he said, from all worry and all belief. But the voice promising him that he could "just lie back on" that which "is here" lied. On the contrary, he was compelled by the inner logic of his monist evolutionist premises to look forever beyond each act to its

consequence, and then to the next act integrating that consequence with other flexible "facts" within enlarged flexible ideas or "reconstruction of experience, the only end to life." It was a journey without rest and without destination, as is the existence of the entire world on monist evolutionist premises.

C. "The Quest for Uncertainty"

We will now examine more closely the undoubtedly enthusiastic welcome accorded Dewey and his fellow process philosophers. As we stated in B (4) above, the felt effect of these concepts was that they provided for man an adventurous progress towards ideal possibilities "exhilaratingly free from extra-empirical or super-natural dogmas" where he can freely live "life as it is." The question must arise just what "life as it is" is. Evolutionist process philosophies have not totally eliminated all order from "life as it is" because God is the Author of identity and order. He permits the sun to shine and the rain to fall on just and unjust (Matthew 5:45), thus graciously and patiently making possible the very lives of His enemies. The entire cornucopia of applied science is based on that "miracle we neither understand nor deserve" (Wigner), identity and order of a universe whose reality corresponds to man's reason so he can tell poisonous mushrooms from edible ones, count drops of anesthetic during surgery, and build the sophisticated digital computers launching his space probes.

What this means is that man increasingly participates, not in emergent random evolution of a self-existing universe, but in increasing revelation of God's orderly creation. We have almost ceased to be amazed at the revelation of previously unknown extensions and details of the world under the microscope and through the telescope, all exhibiting the same features of identity and order. To the Biblical creation believer, there is less reason than ever to doubt that

the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead . . . (Romans 1:20a)

"Negative" evidence falsifying the Darwinian and post-Darwinian evolution from primeval soup-to-man hypotheses are now also increasingly available and publicized. The Biblical creation believer might paraphrase Krikorian by stating that we are today in a period of reassessment "exhilaratingly free from evolutionist dogmas" where we can freely take our stand on the Bible "as it is."

This of course would not please Krikorian, Dewey or atheist process philosophers standing on monist evolutionist premises. And they would counter that after all, we cannot be sure. They would take refuge in the impossibility of absolute certainty to man on the basis of empirical evidences. Further research might always invalidate present "knowledge;" it has done so again and again. And this, they would assert, is in line with a self-existing monist evolutionist concept of the world. No, we can never be sure; the quest for certainty, while it might have "enabled (ancient, primitive man) to carry the burdens of life more successfully" (Dewey, *Quest*, 33) is and must be superseded by ascertaining the most probable temporary answers through the modern scientific method applied across the board. The results of experimen-

tation — testing out theories by action/consequences — is the royal road to more knowledge (but never knowledge *per se* established once and for all).

Russell counters that judging by consequences “involves an endless regress” (Schilpp, 153), for the consequences can then be evaluated only in terms of *their* consequences, and so on. Dewey might answer that consequences once removed would also be the result of other lines of action/experimentation and hence need not count as “endless regress.”. But this in turn readmits “endless regress” by that interconnected maze, monistic continuity of the self-existing naturalistic evolutionist world. Sooner or later *any* attempted evaluation in such a world turns out to be circular, relative, and of course tentative.

One may hence renounce all attempts at evaluation altogether and say with Karl Marx: “Philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways, but the real task is to *alter* it.” proceeding with alteration jobs *regardless of consequences*. This is the hidden premise under Dewey’s conflict-action-growth recipe for human “progress.” Another alternative is withdrawal from the maze of this monistic evolutionist world. It is not surprising that this “drop-out” option is chosen by increasing numbers today. Both alternatives partake of that “freedom” whose other name is lawlessness, that is, seen from the Biblical creation perspective whose starting point is God and His creative decree as the norm for all things.

Those who share Dewey’s monist evolutionist premises with informed consent prize these premises most of all because they invited and perpetuate the quest for uncertainty sanctioning man’s lawlessness. The price paid for this lawlessness sanctioned by uncertainty is the absence of rest and peace. Because the possibility of absolute certainty in the Immutable God-Creator of the Bible jeopardizes man’s lawlessness (based upon supposedly inevitable uncertainty in ■ supposedly self-existing world), this possibility is under greatest and subtlest attack by would-be autonomous man.

The quest for uncertainty produces one result which its academic adherents may not have foreseen. It is that “academic freedom” — the freedom to pursue and teach relevant knowledge and to discuss it freely without restriction from school or public officials or from other source of influence — loses its justification if knowledge is conceived as instrumental action to be evaluated in terms of its consequences. If all teaching and learning is thus experimentation, then no objection in principle can be raised against co-determining participation by society at large in the experimental process. If knowledge is instrumental action and teaching and learning are experimentation, then the separation between academicians as professional pursuers and purveyors of knowledge and “laypersons” breaks down. Not academicians and “subject matter” but rather “people” take the key role in the process, analogous to “child-centered” Dewey-pioneered progressive education in grade and high school. If Yea or Nay, true/false knowledge as the professional domain of highly educated academicians goes, so does their “academic freedom” based upon such knowledge.

We argued earlier that if “being” is conceptualized on a continuum with the phenomenal, changing, or “becoming”, world, then the existence of “being” cannot be independently verified. Since such “being” is an abstract concept, it cannot reveal itself by itself either.

But of course this argument does not hold against the Immutable Personal God and Creator of the Bible. He is a Person, not an abstract concept, and is

therefore able to reveal Himself. Further, he is not on a continuum with this present world because He created it *ex nihilo*.

Let us consider again that there can be no independent valuation for the self-existence and emergent evolution of this present world. "Intelligent beings from outer space" cannot independently confirm it, for the following reasons. Either they were not informed about this earth, or not in contact with it, throughout the earth's existence in time; or else, they were informed about it and/or in contact with it, because they too belong to the monistic naturalist universe — and then they neither were nor are independent of it. Since they are inhabitants of space and time, as they must be as entities visiting us here and in the past or now, they are of course not "supernatural" in the same sense that the God-Creator *ex nihilo* of the Bible is supernatural, but on the same spatio-temporal continuum with us.

Since man's assertion of a self-existing monistic universe cannot be independently validated, it is *in principle weaker* than assertion of Biblical creation. For this assertion can be independently confirmed, namely, by the *supernatural* God-Creator of the Bible Himself.

The fatal flaw in man's own "intelligent inquiry" is precisely that on evolutionist premises it proceeds from man himself, who is but part of the monistic continuum of this present world, and hence, for this very reason, cannot independently validate any assertion about other parts of the universe. For this same reason no one man's inquiry can *independently* validate another man's. Dewey-type process philosophies are condemned to perpetual uncertainty even about their own correctness, because their view of the universe allows no "outside witness." But we who believe in Biblical creation, like Jesus Christ Himself, can answer our adversaries as did He:

It is also written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me . . . you have not known Him; but I know Him; and if I should say, I know Him not, I shall be a liar like unto you: but I know Him, and keep His saying. (John 8:17-18, 55)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have studied Dewey as a monist evolutionist process philosopher par excellence. Particular attention was given to his long and extremely active life including his many travels and great influence abroad; his heavy involvement with many organizations and organized endeavors of what we might call a "left-liberal" orientation today; and the affinity of his philosophy with that of Communism or Marxism due to their shared evolutionist premises.

We dealt in depth with Dewey's religious transition, from his mother's modified pietism to his church's liberal protestantism, and on to fullfledged atheist religious humanism by way of his "crisis" encounter with Darwinian evolutionism, his "mystic experience" stripping him of the last vestige of concern about God, and a heavy dose of Hegelian idealism.

Within Dewey's philosophy we centered on his concept of truth, and also on his underlying compulsion to incessant activity pitting his instrumentalism against rest in God.

Finally we discussed Dewey's "quest for uncertainty" as a means of casting off God's law, and as an unnatural spur to activity for the sake of yet further activity disallowing ends-in-themselves. This "quest for uncertainty" is also a

corollary of the monist evolutionist premises of Dewey's process philosophy. We have also very briefly outlined reasons why human reasoning seeing "being" on a continuum with "becoming" cannot overcome Dewey-type philosophies. We argued that only the witness of the God-Creator of the Bible, Who is independent of man and of the creation, can absolutely and independently validate assertions of truth.

We have sought to provide glimpses of the climate of thought in which instrumentalism flourished — the long-entrenched myth of upward, optimistic evolutionism of the entire nineteenth century.

In conclusion, this paper was written to show that we who rest our faith in the God of the Bible need not fear the onslaught of any philosophy of man. "Greater is He that is in us than he who is in the world" (1 John 4:4). The supernatural God Himself is our shield and our exceeding great reward (Genesis 15:1).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Bible, Authorized (King James) Version

Brown, Dale W., *Understanding Pietism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Cantrill, Hadley, ed., *The Morning Notes of Adelbert Ames Jr., Including a Correspondence with John Dewey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1960.

Chambers, Whitaker, *Witness*. New York: Random House, 1952.

Clark, Gordon, *Dewey*. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1960.

Copleston, Frederick, S.J., *A History of Philosophy* (Vol. 8, Part II, Chapter 16: "The Experimentalism of John Dewey," 109-138). Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc., Image Books, 1967.

Coughlan, Neil, *Young John Dewey*. The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Davidheiser, Bolton, *Evolution and Christian Faith*. Philadelphia, PA: The Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1966.

Dewey, John, *A Common Faith*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1934, 12th Printing July 1955, Yale Paperback 1960.

Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1916, 31st Printing 1959.

Dewey, John, *Experience and Nature*. New York: Dover Publications 1958.

Dewey, John, *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910, First Midland Book Edition, 1965 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Dewey, John, *Logic, The Theory of Inquiry*. New York: Henry Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1938.

Dewey, John, *The Quest for Certainty*. New York: Capricorn Books, C.P. Putnam's Sons, 1929, 1960.

Dicker, Georges, *Dewey's Theory of Knowing*. Philadelphia, PA: Philosophical Monographs, University City Science Center, 3624 Science Center, Philadelphia PA 19104, 1976.

Dykhuizen, George, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

Eastman, Max, "John Dewey." *Atlantic Monthly* 168 (1941), 671-685. Boston

- and New York, 1941.
- Gordon, Ernest, *The Leaven of the Sadducees*. Wheaton, IL: Church League of America, 1407 Hill Avenue, n.d., copyright 1926 by Ernest Gordon, reprinted by Church League of America ca. 1964.
- Hart, Hendrik, *Communal Certainty and Authorized Truth, An Examination of John Dewey's Philosophy of Verification*. Amsterdam, Holland: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1966.
- Hook, Sidney, *John Dewey, An Intellectual Portrait*. New York: John Day, 1939, First Greenwood Reprinting, Westport, CN, Greenwood Press, 1971.
- Humanist Manifestos I and II*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 923 Kensington Avenue, Buffalo, NY 14215, Sixth Printing, 1978.
- Kooistra, Remkes, *The University and its Abolitions*. Hamilton, Ontario, Canada: The Association for Reformed Scientific Studies, 1964, Guardian Publishing Co., Ltd., Distributor.
- Krikorian, Yervant H., *Recent Perspectives in American Philosophy*. The Hague, Holland: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott, *A History of Christianity*. New York: Harper & Row, 1953.
- Lewis, C.S., *Christian Reflections*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1967.
- Lewis, C.S., *The Abolition of Man*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1947, Fourteenth Printing 1976.
- North, Gary, ed., *Foundations of Christian Scholarship*. Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1976.
- Ratner, Sidney, Altman, Jules and Wheeler, James E., ed., *John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley: A Philosophical Correspondence, 1932-1951*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1964.
- Rudd, Augustin, G., *Bending the Twig*. New York: Sons of the American Revolution, 15 Pine Street, New York, NY 10005, 1957, Third Printing 1958.
- Rushdoony, Rousas John, *The Messianic Character of American Education*. Nutley NJ: The Craig Press, 1969.
- Russell, Bertrand, *History of Western Philosophy* (parts dealing with Dewey). New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945.
- Schilpp, Paul A., ed., *The Philosophy of John Dewey*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1939.
- Tippetts, Mark W., "A Digital Universe," *Bible-Science Newsletter*. Minneapolis, MN: Vol. 17, No. 8 (August 1979), p. 1ff.
- White, Morton Gabriel, *The Origin of Dewey's Instrumentalism*. New York: Morningside Heights, Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Wrightsmen, Lawrence S., *Social Psychology (Second Edition)*. Monterrey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1972, 1977.

Clip and mail to: **CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE
AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY**
1429 N. Holyoke
Wichita, Kansas 67208

☐ Enclosed is my payment of \$10* for Sustaining Membership dues. I subscribe to the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society's **Statement of Belief**:

1. The Bible is the written Word of God. It is inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of the social sciences and humanities this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
4. We are an organization of Christian men and women who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman in the image of God and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State _____ ZIP _____

*(\$11 U.S. if you reside outside the USA).

☐ Enclosed is non-member subscription fee of \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) for one year's subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly** (to run through September 1982).

Mail to:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

EDITORIAL

page 1

LETTERS AND COMMENTS

page 1

THE FUTILITY OF AUTONOMOUS SPECULATIVE THOUGHT

Ellen Myers

page 3

THE BISHOP AND "DARWIN'S BULLDOG"

Edward Coleson

page 8

THE PIVOTAL IMPORTANCE OF DINOSAURS
IN CREATIONIST THOUGHT

Lorella Rouster

page 14

CONFLICT-ACTION-GROWTH VS. REST IN GOD:
AN APPRAISAL OF JOHN DEWEY FROM THE
BIBLICAL CREATION PERSPECTIVE

Ellen Myers

page 18

Creation Social Science
& Humanities Society
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wichita, Kansas
Permit No. 929

MO ASSN FOR CREATION
P O BOX 23984
ST LOUIS

MO 63119